

---

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

In April 2000, the Maricopa County Public Defender's Office (MCPD) contracted with Policy Studies Inc. (PSI) to conduct a management study of the Office. The broad objective of the study was to develop a set of recommendations that, if implemented, would likely improve the Office's ability to provide quality legal representation at minimal cost. With input from the MCPD, we refined this objective to include other issues they saw as obstacles to their ability to deliver quality services. These issues fell into three categories:

- Criminal justice system issues; for example, how could the MCPD improve its relations with other justice system agencies?
- Resource issues; for example, how could the MCPD use its existing resources more effectively and efficiently?
- Organizational/management issues; for example, what best practices exist in other defender agencies around the nation that the MCPD may want to adopt?

Our study was sensitive to three facts about the MCPD. First, we recognized that the MCPD is part of a criminal justice system that is highly interdependent; the actions of any single agency affect and are affected by other agencies in the system. Second, despite this interdependence, the MCPD often must be at odds with other justice system agencies in order to uphold its constitutional role in the system and meet the needs of indigent defendants in the criminal justice system. Third, the MCPD is one of four agencies in Maricopa County that provide indigent representation services. This study did not examine the operations of those other defender agencies.

We conducted our assessment between April and July 2000 relying heavily on findings from personal interviews and focus groups, on-site observations of MCPD and court operations, and a review of materials provided by a wide range of justice system stakeholders.

## MCPD STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

We looked for strengths that would provide the building blocks for future reform efforts and we looked for major challenges the MCPD faced in achieving its vision for the office. Chief among the MCPD's major strengths are its management and staff. The management team is dedicated to delivering high quality defender services to clients and improving operations within the Office by being open to new ideas and willing to implement best practices. MCPD staff are skilled, committed professionals who appear satisfied with the work they do, their ability to make decisions, the people they work with, and their accomplishments.

The MCPD also has several good tools that help staff do their work, including (1) a comprehensive *Practice and Procedures Manual*, (2) a good training program, (3) vision and mission statements that establish clear goals for the MCPD, and (4) an automated case counting system to measure workload.

Of the major challenges the Office faces, one of the most important is the lack of autonomy. Autonomy is key to a public defender's structural and professional integrity and we believe the degree of autonomy reflects the degree of respect the justice system has for the defense function and the MCPD. The lack of autonomy is evidenced by (1) the Public Defender's fixed term of office, (2) his external selection by the County Administrator, (3) his lack of control over the MCPD budget, and (4) the fragmentation of defender services among four departments that operate and are managed independently of one another.

Cases are the currency of the MCPD and the ability to deliver high quality services to clients is hampered by excessive caseloads. Based on standards set down by the Arizona Supreme Court, the MCPD has had excessive caseloads in every year since 1993. In recent years, caseloads have been more than 30 percent above the maximum standard. Although it is possible that some of our improvement recommendations, if implemented, could meliorate the situation, they will not eliminate it in the existing environment. We believe the MCPD should take immediate action to address the issue of high caseloads, which are inherently destructive of constitutional and professional standards and may contribute to other problems in the criminal justice system (e.g., delays in case processing).

Finally, we believe the MCPD's existing organizational and management structure is not optimal given the workload and external environment in which the MCPD operates. There are, for example, numerous challenges around (1) leadership and management's span of control (e.g., top down structure, too few managers), (2) staffing (e.g., the office is understaffed given the existing workloads, needs different classes of staff), (2) training (e.g., training internally for attorneys and staff, but also externally for judges, prosecutors, police), and (3) automation (e.g., better internal automation to manage operations and better access to external automation for case information that would improve operational efficiency).

## **KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

We developed 39 recommendations based on our study findings which are presented in a table at the end of this summary. In addition, we developed several interim improvement recommendations that we shared directly with the MCPD, but did not include in our report. Together, the improvement ideas take a comprehensive view of MCPD operations, both from an internal perspective (i.e., how the office is organized and structured) and an external perspective (e.g., how the MCPD interacts with other criminal justice system agencies, how its services affect and are affected by actions of other agencies).

There are several major themes the recommendations address that we believe are critical to outlining an improvement strategy for the MCPD. These themes include (1) public defender autonomy, (2) measuring caseload and workload, (3) dealing with excessive caseloads, (4) front-loading the system, (5) office structure and management, (6) justice system communication and collaboration, and (7) budgeting.

### **Public Defender Autonomy**

Above, we identified the key areas we believe need review to ensure autonomy of the public defender function, namely (1) the absence of a fixed term of office for the public defender, (2) the lack of an external process to select the public defender, (3) the MCPD's lack of control over its budget, and (4) the fragmentation of the defender function. We recommend the following to deal with this issue:

- Maricopa County should create a structure and process to assure appropriate levels of accountability and autonomy for indigent defense (Recommendation 28).

As part of this process, we encourage Maricopa County to establish a Board of Trustees for indigent defense. We believe that one of the Board's responsibilities should be to recruit the heads of the defender departments. We further believe the public defender should have a fixed term of office.

## **Measuring Caseload and Workload**

One recommendation from a 1993 study of the MCPD was that the MCPD and other criminal justice agencies in Maricopa County needed to develop a uniform method of case counting so that caseload comparisons could be made across agencies in a fair and reliable manner. This problem still exists today. Thus, there is no uniformity among criminal justice system agencies in Maricopa County about (1) how a case is defined, (2) when the life of a case begins and ends, and (3) how much work each case involves. For example, unlike other agencies, the MCPD does not count cases until after arraignment, even though its attorneys represent clients at the Justice Courts. In effect, the MCPD is undercounting its caseload and workload.

To address this issue, we make the following recommendations:

- Maricopa County needs to develop a uniform definition of a "case" and a case counting and weighting method applicable beyond the MCPD to at least other indigent representation agencies and preferably to the entire criminal justice system (Recommendation 3).
- Maricopa County should develop a uniform, system-wide funding model for addressing caseload and/or workload increases (Recommendation 4).
- The MCPD should conduct a case weighting study to establish MCPD caseload standards that reflect actual workload and the work required to meet minimum professional standards for defender attorneys (Recommendation 5).

There are several approaches to measuring workload/caseload which we briefly described to the MCPD. Whatever methodology the MCPD decides to apply, however,

it must be understandable and credible, as well as useful. Any assumptions used in the measurement process, including the use of “difficulty factors” to weight cases, must be articulated clearly so that everyone in the criminal justice system—non-attorneys, budget staff, and others outside the indigent defense community—understand the meaning of the numbers and the justification for the formulas.

## **Dealing with Excessive Caseloads**

As discussed above, excessive caseloads are of concern because they are inherently destructive of constitutional and professional standards: they promote inefficiency, ineffective representation and create untenable conditions that adversely affect employee retention. They may also adversely affect other criminal justice entities (e.g., by contributing to delay). Therefore, national and state standards for indigent defense have addressed caseload issues in the most serious terms.

In 1984, the Arizona Supreme Court established maximum caseload standards of 150 felonies and 300 misdemeanors per attorney year. The caseloads of MCPD attorneys have exceeded these standards every year since 1993. For fiscal year 2000, the average felony caseload was 39 percent above the standard and has been running higher than that in fiscal year 2001. The MCPD has the highest average caseload per attorney of any of the defender departments.

Our recommendations for dealing with this issue include:

- Maricopa County and the MCPD should incorporate administrative mechanisms into their budget process that would avoid excessive MCPD caseloads. This should include the development of appropriate standards and procedures, determination of a reasonable caseload, and defender administrative authority not to accept a higher caseload (Recommendation 1).
- The MCPD should not continue to require its attorneys to maintain caseloads in excess of Arizona maximum caseload standards, if in the professional judgment of the Public Defender such caseloads are actually excessive. It is imperative, however, that—to the extent circumstances permit—prior to seeking to withdraw from an excessive caseload, the Public Defender determine whether modifying departmental organization and priorities, reallocating available resources, and seeking additional

resources and systemic changes would reduce his attorneys' caseloads to appropriate, professional levels. If it becomes necessary, the MCPD should seek external assistance in establishing a mechanism to deal with excessive caseload, including the development of appropriate standards, procedures and cost-effective remedies, prior to these problems rising to crisis proportions (Recommendation 2).

If no mechanism can be adopted to anticipate and avoid the development of an excessive caseload, the best response will depend on the earliest identification of any problem and the most expeditious implementation of the most effective response. Such a mechanism limits the damage to defender clients and the judicial process, and minimizes the magnitude of any case management and funding problems.

### **Front-loading the System**

One major impetus for this study was case processing delay. The system has struggled with this problem for many years and has made only limited progress in resolving it, although recent reform efforts seem to be having a more positive impact. We believe that the local legal culture is at least partly at fault for the lack of progress in reducing delay. That is, the system has adopted a set of values and beliefs that frustrate delay reduction.

A substantial contributor to delay is the lack of systemic front-loading; i.e., the long early period in the life of a case without any substantive work on it by the entire court system. Case processing practices also contribute to delay, in particular practices relating to trial readiness on the first trial setting. Most participants do not expect to go to trial on the first trial setting and so are rarely prepared to do so. Continuance requests are granted routinely to both sides, with the result that many cases do not plead out early and may not go to trial until the second or later trial setting.

The following recommendations address the issue of delay through front-loading of the system.

- The system needs to create an effective way to disseminate accurate, complete discovery promptly (Recommendation 31b).

Regardless of what decisions are made by the work group charged with responsibility to develop approaches to sharing discovery information, the various justice system agencies need to be vigilant to ensure that discovery is forthcoming and made available to the County Attorney and the Public Defender in a timely manner.

- The system should consider assigning cases to a Superior Court judge when the initial complaint is filed in the Clerk's Office or as soon as practical thereafter (Recommendation 31e).

There is currently a long delay between case initiation and arraignment in Superior Court. No one is in a position to move and monitor cases during this period. Assigning cases (and Superior Court case numbers) at filing would allow closer and more efficient tracking of case progress, but it also would require additional administrative effort to balance caseloads after activity in the Justice Courts. If the number of cases going to Justice Courts were reduced, balancing case assignments would be less difficult.

- Early appointment of a public defender to a case should become standard practice (Recommendation 31i).

Earlier assignment of counsel should result in earlier intervention, fewer gaps in case processing (i.e., the time during which the cases are dormant), and more expeditious case resolution. In the current back-loaded system, the trial attorney typically is not assigned until arraignment, weeks after arrest. When defender attorneys are assigned to individual judges, early appointment and assignment of counsel can only be effective if the cases have been assigned to a specific judge and given a case number.

- If authorized, the County Attorney's Office (MCAO) and the court should promote the direct filing of information without preliminary hearings. If not currently authorized, the MACO should define and follow more limited criteria for presenting cases at preliminary hearing in the Justice Courts and use the grand jury more extensively (Recommendation 32).

The basic options to preliminary hearings are direct filing or presentation to the grand jury. In either option, the prosecution has an opportunity to evaluate its witnesses' credibility. Many states (e.g., Florida) have used direct filing for most of this century. The common practice in those jurisdictions is for the prosecutor to take sworn testimony from the victim and/or the investigating detective.

- The system should immediately create an interim case management system that presents at least the minimum data needed to monitor and manage cases (Recommendation 37).

If the justice system hopes to comply with Rule 8 deadlines, it cannot wait for the information system of the future to be implemented. Nor can it wait for partial adjustments to existing systems. Court Administration has identified and is continuing to identify the key data the court needs to manage cases better. With input from its justice agency partners, the court should identify the minimal data that are needed to manage cases well. The data should be in a format that can be efficiently used by and shared among the key stakeholders in the system.

## **Office Structure and Management**

Greater front-loading of the system represents a major change in MCPD practice that will require some staff reallocation and realignment of office operations. As a result, we believe the MCPD needs to develop a careful plan for effecting that change, a plan that would come from a thorough study of its operations. Such a study would include an assessment of its existing office space, the way the office is organized and managed, staffing, training, and workflow. Our final report offers one alternative organizational model as a point of discussion; a model the MCPD could use to generate additional ideas about office structure. Whatever structure is defined, it should accommodate some of the other recommendations we make for improving internal operations. Among them are:

- The MCPD needs to conduct a thorough study of its entire operations, with particular focus on its support services, as the office moves from a back-end loaded to a front-end loaded organization (Recommendation 9).



- The MCPD should improve the amount and quality of its office space and the other conditions under which its lawyers and staff meet with clients. It should also design its space to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of office operations (Recommendation 10).
- The MCPD should define a career development path for its attorneys. Case assignments should be linked to that career path (Recommendation 14).
- The MCPD should increase its attorney-support staff ratio to 1:1. (Recommendation 17).
- The MCPD should hire new staff in different functional areas (Recommendation 18).
- The MCPD should review its office-wide training plan to promote staff development (Recommendation 20).
- The MCPD should employ or have immediate and continuous access to sufficient numbers of technical personnel familiar with its computers, departmental functions, and procedures in order to re-engineer its information system and automate that system (Recommendation 24).
- The MCPD should re-engineer its workflow and refine all of its current office procedures in preparation for automation (Recommendation 25).

These recommendations reflect opportunities for the MCPD to improve its efficiency and effectiveness.

### **Justice System Communication and Collaboration**

The Maricopa County justice system has a long history of inter-agency discussion and joint efforts to resolve justice system problems. For the last ten years, the Maricopa County Justice Coordinating Committee (McJustice) has been the major forum for those discussions. There has been some recent concern that McJustice has not operated collaboratively, however we believe it could be the forum for information sharing and policy making that needs to occur to improve the criminal justice system.

We recognize that the justice system was designed to distribute power to each of the branches of government and that, consistent with the design of the system, conflict will naturally arise among the participating agencies. While conflicts of interest exist, however, interests can and do coincide and this creates the basis for collaboration and consensus decision making. We believe that McJustice is an appropriate forum for the discussion and resolution of key issues facing the justice system. We also believe that McJustice should reexamine its charge and operating principles and then take the steps necessary to ensure a fully participatory process that listens to and respects the views of all the parties.

One of the major conclusions from our interviews with justice system practitioners is that the quality of case data and sharing of the data need to be improved. There is disagreement among key justice system leaders regarding the accuracy of existing data, even though the court's data system has been audited and approved by the State Court Administrator's Office. For many practitioners in the system, however, the data to fully manage the cases are not there. Even if they were there, it is not clear they would be used because of the disagreements about data accuracy.

Among our recommendations in this area are the following:

- All Maricopa County justice system agencies should be involved in identifying issues and reaching decisions having significant system-wide impact in a collaborative and participatory manner (Recommendation 29).
- The Maricopa County criminal justice system should immediately create an interim case management system that presents at least the minimum data needed to monitor and manage cases. In the long term, the County should promote the development of a cooperative, integrated, automated information system which would permit the governmental entities within the criminal justice system to share appropriate information (such as the procedural status of individual cases) on a real-time basis (Recommendation 37).

If the justice system hopes to comply with Rule 8 deadlines, it cannot wait for the information system of the future to be implemented. Nor can it wait for partial adjustments to existing systems. Court Administration has identified and is continuing to identify the key data the court needs to manage cases better. With input from its

justice agency partners, the court should identify the minimal data that are needed to manage cases well. The data should be in a format that can be efficiently used by and shared among the key stakeholders in the system.

## **Budgeting**

Based on our review, we believe there is a possible imbalance of funding in the system among criminal justice agencies. Our belief is driven by the following statistics from 1989 through 1998.

- The number of judicial officers increased from 85 to 103, a 21 percent increase.
- The number of court support staff increased from 372 to 560, approximately a 51 percent increase.
- The court's budget increased from \$32 to \$43 million, a 34 percent increase.
- Case filings increased from 14,742 to 24,708, a 68 percent increase.

We were unable to gather adequate statistics about increases in the MCPD's and MCAO's budgets for the same time period, but our impression is that the staffing and budget increases in those agencies have not been comparable to the increases given to the court. For this reason, we make the following recommendation:

- Maricopa County should work toward developing a unified budget process for the criminal justice system within a reasonable time, perhaps two to three years. Budget allocations should be made based upon an impact analysis to ensure sufficient and balanced funding to all system participants, including indigent defense (Recommendation 39).

In the last few years, the court's success in securing additional funding in part reflects good strategic thinking. As federal funding for law enforcement increased without additional resources to other agencies in the justice system, the court anticipated the likely downstream effects of additional law enforcement officers on its workload and outlined a strategy to meet increased demand. Part of that strategy included a "Fill the Gap" Initiative the court successfully presented to the State Legislature. The other agencies in the justice system have not been as fortunate financially. Nevertheless, they need to collaborate with the court in identifying resource needs and in working to ensure those needs are met.

## RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY

### Dealing with Excessive Caseloads

1. Maricopa County and the MCPD should incorporate administrative mechanisms into their budget process that would avoid excessive MCPD caseloads. This should include the development of appropriate standards and procedures, determination of a reasonable caseload, and defender administrative authority not to accept a higher caseload.
2. The MCPD should not continue to require its attorneys to maintain caseloads in excess of Arizona maximum caseload standards, if in the professional judgment of the Public Defender such caseloads are actually excessive. It is imperative, however, that—to the extent circumstances permit—prior to seeking to withdraw from an excessive caseload, the Public Defender determine whether modifying departmental organization and priorities, reallocating available resources, and seeking additional resources and systemic changes would reduce his attorneys' caseloads to appropriate, professional levels. If it becomes necessary, the MCPD should seek external assistance in establishing a mechanism to deal with excessive caseload, including the development of appropriate standards, procedures and cost-effective remedies, prior to these problems rising to crisis proportions.

### Case Counting and Weighting

3. Maricopa County needs to develop a uniform definition of a “case” and a case counting and weighting method applicable beyond the MCPD to at least other indigent representation agencies and preferably to the entire criminal justice system.
4. Maricopa County should develop a uniform, system-wide funding model for addressing caseload and/or workload increases.
5. The MCPD should conduct a case weighting study to establish MCPD caseload standards that reflect actual workload and the work required to meet minimum professional standards for defender attorneys.
6. The MCPD should articulate general policies or practices that affect all case categories and link each category to specific policies or practices affecting that category.

### MCPD Management

7. The Management Team should reevaluate the purpose and scope of MCPD data collection. The Management Team should assign a task force to create report formats in conjunction with end-users.
8. The Management Team should continue to refine the MCPD *Practice and Procedure Manual*. Furthermore, it should periodically review the *Manual* and make recommendations for revisions consistent with the ethical and professional practice of law.

## RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY

### MCPD Operations

9. The MCPD needs to conduct a thorough study of its entire operations, with particular focus on its support services, as the office moves from a back-end loaded to a front-end loaded organization.
10. The MCPD should improve the amount and quality of its office space and the other conditions under which its lawyers and staff meet with clients. It should also design its space to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of office operations.
11. The MCPD should give greater emphasis to early representation of clients (i.e., during the period from arrest to arraignment).
12. The MCPD should review and evaluate the pilot project in Trial Group E, including the expansion of horizontal representation.
13. The MCPD should increase its efforts to promote a culture of professionalism, trust, and courtesy toward clients, fellow workers, judges and the general public.
14. The MCPD should define a career development path for its attorneys. Case assignments should be linked to that career path.
15. The MCPD should consider establishing a defender Resource Center within the office. The Resource Center should include an upgraded, electronic library.
16. Special actions brought by the MCPD should be handled by designated attorneys in the appellate division, rather than by the MCPD's training director.
17. The MCPD should increase its attorney-support staff ratio to 1:1.
18. The MCPD should hire new staff in different functional areas.
19. The MCPD should review and revise its personnel classification and compensation plan to bring that plan into better alignment with similar plans in client-oriented law firms.
20. The MCPD should review its office-wide training plan to promote staff development. Specifically, the MCPD should:
  - Expand the number and refine the content of its training programs;
  - Survey its clients and use the survey findings to refine its training programs;
  - Consider establishing linkages with corporations in Maricopa County to access private sector training expertise; and
  - Seek funding to allow more staff to attend professional meetings and workshops inside and outside of Arizona.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY**

21. In developing a training plan for management and supervisory personnel, the MCPD should consider establishing linkages with:
  - Private-sector corporations headquartered in Maricopa County that have management training expertise, and
  - Out-of-state public defender offices that have recognized, well-developed management capabilities.
22. The MCPD as an organization and through its staff should continue to expand its participation in state and national organizations concerned with improving the delivery of defender services.
23. The MCPD should expand its written, office-wide automation plan to include a system-wide focus.
24. The MCPD should employ or have immediate and continuous access to sufficient numbers of technical personnel familiar with its computers, departmental functions, and procedures in order to reengineer its information system and automate that system.
25. The MCPD should re-engineer its workflow and refine all of its current office procedures in preparation for automation.
26. The MCPD should continue to coordinate with Maricopa County's Chief Information Officer and ensure early and meaningful participation in the development of the new criminal justice information system.
27. The MCPD should continue to take a leadership role in improving the defense function in Maricopa County, especially by continuing to (1) provide training for other criminal defense service providers, (2) improve its coordination with those providers, and (2) educate the public about its services.
28. Maricopa County should create a structure and process to assure appropriate levels of accountability and autonomy for indigent defense.

## RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY

### External System

29. All Maricopa County justice system agencies should be involved in identifying issues and reaching decisions having significant system-wide impact in a collaborative and participatory manner.
30. Delay reduction should be the first issue the McJustice membership addresses.
  - 30a. McJustice should make recommendations to the Arizona Supreme Court that set realistic and appropriate case disposition time standards.
  - 30b. The time standards should limit the time between events in the processing of the case to the amount of time needed to properly prepare for each event and no longer.
  - 30c. In developing the time standards, McJustice should consider shorter time standards for in-custody cases and longer time standards for out-of-custody cases.
  - 30d. McJustice should design a program to implement the case disposition time standards that is phased in over a period of time and uses pilot projects to refine implementation. The outcomes from the pilot should be monitored and evaluated.
31. All Maricopa County justice system agencies should continuously identify and seek to eliminate barriers to the fair and early disposition of criminal cases.
  - 31a. A permanent work group that is truly representative of the justice system should be established to create an effective system to disseminate accurate, complete discovery promptly.
  - 31b. The MCAO should make greater efforts to provide automatic, early and complete discovery. The MCPD should continue its efforts to secure discovery that is not forthcoming. The court must consistently and firmly enforce discovery rules.
  - 31c. Starting times for morning calendars within a quad should be staggered to reduce attorney conflicts and ending times should guarantee a minimum of five hours of trial time.
  - 31d. The MCPD and MCAO should modify their attorney assignment systems to minimize calendar conflicts.
  - 31e. Consideration should be given to assigning cases to a Superior Court judge when the initial complaint is filed in the Clerk's Office or as soon as practical thereafter.
  - 31f. Each judge should be held accountable for the disposition of all cases in the judge's division within the time standards. Similarly, all judges in each quad should be held jointly responsible for the timely disposition of all cases assigned to that quad.
  - 31g. The MCPD and the MCAO should have an informed coverage attorney to provide case information at every calendar call.
  - 31h. The MCPD and MCAO should consistently provide experienced attorneys to mentor inexperienced trial attorneys.
  - 31i. Early appointment of the Public Defender to a case should become the practice. The MCPD should have the resources necessary to permit the attorneys to interview defendants prior to or at the initial appearance hearing.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY**

- 31j. The MCAO's charging attorneys should consult with and, in selected cases, take sworn testimony from the victim and police officer most familiar with the case prior to making a filing decision.
- 31k. After consultation with other justice system agencies, the frequency of initial appearance sessions should be studied to reduce their number and to allow for meaningful preparation and participation by the MCAO, MCPD and Pretrial Services so that the remaining hearings can become more substantial.
- 31l. The MCAO should give greater discretion to its attorneys to negotiate pleas and simplify its internal plea review process.
- 32. If authorized, the MCAO and the court should promote the direct filing of information without preliminary hearings. If not currently authorized, the MCAO should define and follow more limited criteria for presenting cases at preliminary hearing in the Justice Courts and use the grand jury more extensively.
- 33. After careful evaluation, Maricopa County should expand its diversion opportunities for felony defendants. Even before it expands opportunities, the County should allocate additional resources to the Pretrial Services Agency.
- 34. The Clerk of Court, with the support of the court, court administration and County administration, should devise and execute a crash program to bring minute entries up to date.
- 35. The Clerk of Court should review the role of the courtroom clerk and the role of minute entries to identify whether the courtroom clerks' duties and/or minute entries should be redefined.
- 36. Once current with the minute entries, the Clerk should explore more ways to remain current. The Clerk should seek funding for a record management study which would include the current minute book entry system.
- 37. The Maricopa County criminal justice system should immediately create an interim case management system that presents at least the minimum data needed to monitor and manage cases. In the long term, the County should promote the development of a cooperative, integrated, automated information system which would permit the governmental entities within the criminal justice system to share appropriate information (such as the procedural status of individual cases) on a real-time basis.
- 38. Juror exit questionnaires should be designed and administered.
- 39. Maricopa County should work toward developing a unified budget process for the criminal justice system within a reasonable time, perhaps two to three years. Budget allocations should be made based upon an impact analysis to ensure sufficient and balanced funding to all system participants, including indigent defense.